



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,317	01/05/2001	Thomas R. Goodwin		5059

7590

01/07/2005

Michael E. Mauney
Attorney at Law
P. O. 10266
Southport, NC 28461

EXAMINER

MAURO JR, THOMAS J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,317

Applicant(s)

GOODWIN, THOMAS R.

Examiner

Thomas J. Mauro Jr.

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on September 10, 2004. Claims 1-20 remain pending and are again presented for examination. A formal action on the merits of claims 1-20 follows.

2. Objections made against the drawings have obviated in light of the drawing corrections made.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed September 10, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicant contends that Good fails to teach a segregated database, whereas claim 1, and likewise, claims 8 and 14 call for this limitation.

In response to argument (A), Examiner asserts that Good does disclose a segregated database for storing records. Using the standard definition of the word *segregate*, namely, *set apart or separate*, this limitation is in fact, disclosed by Good. Good discloses storing records in a database of a regional communications terminal, i.e. server, which is separate or set apart from the local communications terminal, i.e. server/computer. See Figure 2 and Col. 7 lines 17-36. A second back-up is also created by a central equipment manager which receives an upload of

Art Unit: 2143

vehicle status information from regional communication terminals and stores the information in its own database, i.e. segregated or separate from regional and local databases. See Col. 7 lines 44-53. Additionally, records are stored and keyed by two separate unique identifiers, namely a control number and a vehicle identifier, i.e. client identifier. See Figure 4 and Col. 5 lines 60-67. Thereby, each record, i.e. vehicle record, is unique or separate from all other records by both a client identifier, i.e. vehicle identification number, and also a unique control number generated for each service request. Based upon the applicant's arguments presented on page 6 of the amendment, Applicant is arguing that the records are separate or segregated, whereas, the claim language recites the database is segregated. Based upon the recited claim language, the Examiner demurs to the applicant's assertion as Good explicitly shows segregated databases located on separate computing, i.e. server, systems.

(B) Applicant contends that Good fails to teach wherein the records are segregated from each other.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., records that are segregated from all other records) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Instead, as the instant invention is claimed, it is the databases which are segregated or separate from each other. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification

Art Unit: 2143

are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

(C) Applicant contends that Good-Sandifer fails to teach that the records are permanent in the server and back-up systems, whereas claims 1, 8 and 14 call for this limitation.

In response to argument (C), Examiner asserts that Good-Sandifer does in fact teach that records are permanently stored, i.e. write-protected, in the server system and backup system. Sandifer, Col. 35 lines 14-30, discloses that once an inspection is noted anywhere in the Electronic Logbook, it is preferably permanently attached to that record. Whether during transfer or not, write-protection prevents editing of an inspection record. See Col. 35 lines 24-28. Based upon the claim language recited in claims 1 and also 8 and 14, it is in the server system and backup system where the record is undeletable or permanent. Thus, the combination of Good and Sandifer teach those limitations as Good discloses transferring the records to a database in the server, i.e. regional communications system and the back-up, i.e. central equipment manager (See rejection below) and Sandifer discloses that inspection records are permanent during transfer to other sites (See rejection below), i.e. the regional and central communication sites of Good. During patent examination and prosecution, claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 1184, 26 USPQ2d 1057, 1059 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404, 162 USPQ 541, 550 (CCPA 1969). Giving the instant claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, “permanent records in

Art Unit: 2143

said server system and back-up system” is broad enough to read on the write protection of inspection records during transfer to other sites of Sandifer.

(D) Applicant contends that there is no motivation taught within either of the references to combine Good and Sandifer.

In response to argument (D), Examiner asserts that the motivation provided, namely, to “provide security for each record so that critical information is not tampered with or changed” would have been in the knowledge available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, a second reason to combine would be to insure data integrity which would serve to accurately depict a vehicle’s condition thereby preventing a possible breakdown, accident, or worse yet, death due to a maliciously altered log. This second motivation, likewise, would be in the knowledge available to one skilled in the art for blatantly obvious reasons. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the notion of adding write protection or security to data is notoriously well known and numerous obvious motivations, like the ones presented, exist.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Good (U.S. 6,308,120) in view of Sandifer (U.S. 6,292,806).

Regarding claim 1, Good teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a method comprising:

(a) establishing a client system [**Good -- Figures 1 and 2 and Col. 3 lines 14-15 and lines 28-32 – Local communications terminal at service station is client system**];

(b) establishing a server system [**Good -- Figures 1 and 2 and Col. 3 lines 14-27 – Regional communications terminals act as a server to the local communications terminals belonging to that region**];

(c) establishing a back-up system [**Good -- Figures 1 and 2 and Col. 3 line 13 and lines 44-49 – Central Equipment Manager act as a backup server by storing all service status information for each region**];

(d) connecting said client system, said server system, and said back-up system [**Good -- Figures 1 and 2 and Col. 3 lines 32-62 – Local and regional communications terminals, along with central equipment manager, communicates over a Wide Area Network (WAN)**];

Art Unit: 2143

(e) under the control of said client system, displaying a record form, and in response to data entered on said client system, completing data fields in said record form and sending said completed record form to said server system with a unique client identifier [Good -- **Figure 4, Col. 5 lines 61-67 – Col. 6 lines 1-4, Col. 6 lines 64-67 – Col. 7 lines 1-13, Col. 7 lines 29-36, Col. 8 lines 21 – 51 and Col. 9 lines 14-23 – Vehicle repair and server information is entered by client system into a record and stored locally. In near real-time, vehicle status file, i.e. containing record, is sent to server, i.e. regional communications terminal with both a control number and vehicle identification number which both uniquely identify the service and the client, i.e. vehicle, respectively**];

(f) under the control of said server system, receiving said record with said data and said unique client identifier, and storing said record in a segregated database keyed to said client identifier [Good -- **Figures 2 (Database attached to regional communications terminal) and 8, Col. 7 lines 29-36 and Col. 10 lines 55-61 – Regional communications terminal receives file containing vehicle and service records and stores them in its local database. These records are stored in a database containing multiple fields which are keyed by either of the unique identifiers, i.e. service identifier (control number) or client identifier (vehicle identification number)**];

(g) under the control of said back-up system, receiving said completed record form permanently stored in said server system, and making a permanent back-up so that a back-up of said segregated database is made [Good -- **Figure 8, Col. 7 lines 43-53 and Col. 11 lines 20-30 – Regional communications terminal, i.e. server, sends file containing all vehicle service**

Art Unit: 2143

and status information to central equipment manager to provide backup to the regional communications terminals database],

whereby said client system, said server system, said back-up system, and said means for connection are used to make and store a record in said server system that is accessible to said client system and backed up in said back-up system.

Good fails to explicitly teach that the record is permanent and unalterable or undeletable.

Sandifer, however, discloses that write protection is provided such that each inspection is permanently, i.e. lasting forever, attached to each record so that it is unalterable [Sandifer -- Col. 35 lines 14-22].

Both Good and Sandifer disclose methods concerned with keeping maintenance / service records for transportation equipment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the write protection to provide permanent, unalterable records, as taught by Sandifer into the invention of Good, in order to provide security for each record so that critical information is not tampered with or changed.

Regarding claim 2, Good-Sandifer teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1, including wherein under the control of said server system providing automatic warnings of non-compliance with regulations and sending said warnings to said client system whereby aid is provided in avoiding inadvertent regulatory violations [Good -- Col. 11 lines 61-67 – Col. 12 lines 1-7 and lines 29-41 – Automatic advisory warning will pop-up on local communications terminal to indicate vehicle has violated company regulation with

Art Unit: 2143

regards to number of services performed. This alerts local facility to consider not renting a particular vehicle to avoid possible problems].

Regarding claim 8, Good teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a system comprising:

(a) a client computer having a display, a keyboard for data entry, a network connection, and software enabling said client computer to connect to said network connection [Good -- **Figures 1 and 2, Col. 3 lines 14-15 and lines 28-32 and Col. 5 lines 16-37 – Local communications terminal at service station is client system which has a display, keyboard, mouse, network connection and software];**

(b) a server computer with a network connection and record keeping software [Good -- **Figures 1 and 2, Col. 3 lines 14-27 and Col. 5 lines 16-51 – Regional communications terminals act as a server to the local communications terminals belonging to that region. Regional terminal has network connection and software, i.e. FoxPro™];**

(c) back-up data storage computer having a network connection [Good -- **Figures 1 and 2 and Col. 3 line 13 and lines 32-62 – Central Equipment Manager act as a backup server by storing all service status information for each region. It too is connected to the network];**

(d) means for making a record on said client computer and sending said record on said network connection to said server computer, said record keyed to a unique client identifier [Good -- **Figure 4, Col. 5 lines 61-67 – Col. 6 lines 1-4, Col. 6 lines 64-67 – Col. 7 lines 1-13, Col. 7 lines 29-36, Col. 8 lines 21 – 51 and Col. 9 lines 14-23 – Vehicle repair and server**

Art Unit: 2143

information is entered by client system into a record and stored locally. In near real-time, vehicle status file, i.e. containing record, is sent to server, i.e. regional communications terminal with both a control number and vehicle identification number which both uniquely identify the service and the client, i.e. vehicle, respectively];

(e) means for receiving a client system generated record in said server, storing and organizing said client system generated record with record keeping software in said server computer whereby once a client system generated record is recorded and stored in said server system [Good -- **Figures 2 (Database attached to regional communications terminal) and 8, Col. 5 lines 48-51, Col. 7 lines 29-36 and Col. 10 lines 55-61 – Regional communications terminal receives file containing vehicle and service records and stores them in its local database, controlled and operated by software]; and**

(f) means for making a back-up copy of said client generated record in said back-up data storage computer [Good -- **Figure 8, Col. 7 lines 43-53 and Col. 11 lines 20-30 – Regional communications terminal, i.e. server, sends file containing all vehicle service and status information to central equipment manager to provide backup to the regional communications terminals].**

Good fails to explicitly teach that the record is permanent and unalterable or undeletable.

Sandifer, however, discloses that write protection is provided such that each inspection is permanently, i.e. lasting forever, attached to each record so that it is unalterable [Sandifer -- **Col. 35 lines 14-22].**

Both Good and Sandifer disclose methods concerned with keeping maintenance / service records for transportation equipment.

Art Unit: 2143

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the write protection to provide permanent, unalterable records, as taught by Sandifer into the invention of Good, in order to provide security for each record so that critical information is not tampered with or changed.

Regarding claim 9, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim

2. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 9 is rejected under the same rationale.

6. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Good (U.S. 6,308,120) and Sandifer (U.S. 6,292,806), as applied to claim 2 above, in view of Chapin, Jr. (U.S. 5,931,878).

Regarding claim 3, Good-Sandifer teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 2 above, but fail to teach providing notification of maintenance requirements to the client.

Chapin, however, discloses a computerized prompting system which provides a maintenance reminder on the screen of a computer user [**Chapin -- Figures 1 and 2 and Col. 2 lines 48-58**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the maintenance reminders, as taught by Chapin into the invention of Good-Sandifer, in order to alert users to upcoming maintenance requirements and to remove the possibility of forgetting to have maintenance, possibility critical maintenance, performed.

Regarding claim 10, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 3. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 10 is rejected under the same rationale.

7. Claims 4-7 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Good (U.S. 6,308,120), Sandifer (U.S. 6,292,806), Chapin, Jr. (U.S. 5,931,878), as applied to claims 3 and 10 above respectively, in view of Evans (U.S. 6,347,329).

Regarding claim 4, Good-Sandifer-Chapin teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 3 above, but fail to explicitly teach that the records are only accessible to a client using a unique client identifier.

Evans, however, discloses a medical records system which contains a database of patient information accessible to users in varying degree based upon a unique client identifier, i.e. password [Evans -- Col. 2 lines 27-33 and Col. 15 lines 24-34].

Good, Sandifer and Evans disclose methods concerned with keeping information records in a database stored over a network.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate requiring a unique client identifier to access a database of records, as taught by Evans into the invention of Good-Sandifer-Chapin, in order to provide security for each record so that critical information is not tampered with, changed, or viewed by unauthorized users, which provides protection of the data.

Regarding claim 5, Good-Sandifer-Chapin-Evans teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 4 above, wherein under the control of said server system, providing search capabilities to said client system for searching of said segregated database **[Good -- Col. 9 lines 40-45 – Database can be searched in a variety of ways]**.

Regarding claim 6, Good-Sandifer-Chapin-Evans teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 5 above, wherein under the control of said server system, providing a tracking history of all record forms stored in said segregated database **[Good -- Figures 4 and 5, Col. 6 lines 64-67 – Col. 7 lines 1-13 and Col. 9 lines 40-45 – History of all recorded record forms for a particular vehicle can be viewed as a report, which provides a tracking history of the maintenance/service work performed]**.

Regarding claim 7, Good-Sandifer-Chapin-Evans teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 6 above, wherein under the control of said client system providing a means for printing copies of record forms **[Good -- Col. 5 line 21 and Col. 12 lines 37-41 – System allows user to print service events, i.e. records]** stored in said segregated database keyed to said client identifier **[Good -- Figure 4, Col. 5 lines 60-67 – Col. 6 lines 1-4, Col. 6 lines 64-67 – Col. 7 lines 1-13 – Records are stored in a database containing multiple fields which are keyed by either of the unique identifiers, i.e. service identifier (control number) or client identifier (vehicle identification number)]**.

Regarding claims 11, 12 and 13, these are system claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 4, 5 and 7 respectively. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 11, 12 and 13 are rejected under the same rationale.

8. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Good (U.S. 6,308,120) in view of Sandifer (U.S. 6,292,806) and further in view of Evans (U.S. 6,347,329).

Regarding claim 14, Good teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a system comprising:

(a) a client computer having a display, means for data entry, means for connection to a network, and software using said means for network connection to connect a remote server computer [Good -- Figures 1 and 2, Col. 3 lines 14-15 and lines 28-40 and Col. 5 lines 16-37 – Local communications terminal at service station is client system which has a display, keyboard, mouse, software and a network connection to communicate with regional communications terminal, i.e. remotely located server];

(b) said remote server computer with means for network connection to said client computer and said client computer software, and with record keeping software [Good -- Figures 1 and 2, Col. 3 lines 14-40 and Col. 5 lines 16-51 – Regional communications terminals act

Art Unit: 2143

as a server to the local communications terminals belonging to that region. Regional terminal has network connection to communicate with local communications terminals and database, i.e. record keeping, software, i.e. FoxPro™];

(c) said record keeping software with means for providing automatic warnings of non-compliance with regulations to said client computer [Good -- Col. 11 lines 61-67 – Col. 12 lines 1-7 and lines 29-41 – Automatic advisory warning will pop-up on local communications terminal to indicate vehicle has violated company regulation with regards to number of services performed. This alerts local facility to consider not renting a particular vehicle to avoid possible problems];

(d) said record keeping software in said remote server computer with means for storing records [Good Figures 2 and 8, Col. 5 lines 48-51, Col. 7 lines 29-36 and Col. 10 lines 55-61 – Regional communications terminal receives file containing vehicle and service records and stores them in its local database, controlled and operated by software]; whereby said client computer, said remote server computer, and said record keeping software can be used to make and store record in said server computer.

Good fails to explicitly teach that the record is permanent and unalterable or undeletable, that the system is compliant with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations and that the records are only accessible to a client using a unique client identifier.

Sandifer, however, discloses that write protection is provided such that each inspection is permanently, i.e. lasting forever, attached to each record so that it is unalterable [Sandifer -- Col. 35 lines 14-22]. Furthermore, Sandifer discloses a system with electronic logbooks which are in compliance with FAA regulations [Sandifer -- Col. 4 lines 62-67 – Col. 5 lines 1-9].

Art Unit: 2143

In addition, Evans discloses a medical records system which contains a database of patient information accessible to users in varying degree based upon a unique client identifier, i.e. password **[Evans -- Col. 2 lines 27-33 and Col. 15 lines 24-34]**.

Good, Sandifer and Evans disclose methods concerned with keeping information records in a database stored over a network.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the write protection to provide permanent, unalterable records, and FAA regulations, as taught by Sandifer, along with requiring a unique client identifier to access a database of records, as taught by Evans into the invention of Good, in order to provide security for each record so that critical information is not tampered with, changed, or viewed by unauthorized users, which provides protection of the data. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine FAA regulations into the database system to provide a system which holds up to the quality initiative, standards and rules set up by the FAA.

Regarding claim 15, Good-Sandifer-Evans teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 14 above, wherein said record keeping software keeps plane maintenance records to assure compliance with FAA regulations regarding plane maintenance **[Sandifer -- Col. 33 lines 62-67 – Col. 34 lines 1-41 – software keeps maintenance/service records of plane in a logbook to be in compliance with FAA regulations]**.

Art Unit: 2143

9. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Good (U.S. 6,308,120), Sandifer (U.S. 6,292,806) and Evans (U.S. 6,347,329), as applied to claim 15 above, in view of Jiang (U.S. 6,278,913).

Regarding claim 16, Good-Sandifer-Evans teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 15 above, but fails to explicitly teach keep pilot flying records. Jiang, however, discloses an automated flight data management system which keeps pilot flying records [**Jiang -- Figure 12, Col. 3 lines 7-17 and Col. 15 lines 49-64**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate pilot flight logs, as taught Jiang into the invention of Good-Sandifer-Evans, in order to automate the preparation of and to electronically provide pilot information.

10. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Good (U.S. 6,308,120), Sandifer (U.S. 6,292,806), Evans (U.S. 6,347,329) and Jiang (U.S. 6,278,913), as applied to claim 16 above, in view of Chapin, Jr. (U.S. 5,931,878).

Regarding claim 17, Good-Sandifer-Evans-Jiang teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 16 above, but fails to explicitly teach providing notification of maintenance requirements to the client.

Art Unit: 2143

Chapin, however, discloses a computerized prompting system which provides a maintenance reminder on the screen of a computer user [**Chapin -- Figures 1 and 2 and Col. 2 lines 48-58**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the maintenance reminders, as taught by Chapin into the invention of Good-Sandifer-Evans-Jiang, in order to alert users to upcoming maintenance requirements and to remove the human forgetfulness factor.

Regarding claim 18 and 20, these are system claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 5 and 7. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 18 and 20 are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 19, Good-Sandifer-Evans-Jiang-Chapin teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 18 above, including a back-up server whereby duplicate copies are kept of records recorded in database [**Good -- Figure 8, Col. 7 lines 43-53 and Col. 11 lines 20-30 -- Regional communications terminal, i.e. server, sends file containing all vehicle service and status information to central equipment manager to provide backup to the regional communications terminals database**].

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-3917. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TJM

December 28, 2004



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100